arXiv:1403.6424v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 25 Mar 2014

Comment on 'Self-organized cooperative criticality in coupled complex systems'

Rahul Dandekar[1,*]

[1]*Department of Theoretical Physics, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Homi Bhabha Road, Mumbai 400005, India*

PACS numbers: 89.75.Fb, 05.65.+b

In a recent Letter, Liu and Hu [1] presented a model of toppling-coupled sandpiles, where they found that the avalanche exponents for two toppling-coupled sandpiles are the same as those for a single uncoupled sandpile. In this Comment we provide a proof of this observation for the case when there is conservation of grains in the bulk.

Liu and Hu study two sandpiles, denoted by $z_1(i)$ and $z_2(i)$, where i stands for the lattice co-ordinates, which topple when corresponding sites in both piles are above threshold, ie, $z_1(i) \geq z$ and $z_2(i) \geq z$, where z is the co-ordination number of the underlying lattice. In a toplling move, sites topple grains to their respective neighbours ($z_{1,2}(i) \to z_{1,2}(i) - z$ and $z_{1,2}(j) \to z_{1,2}(j) + 1$ where site j is a neighbour of site i). Grains are added independently to both sandpiles, and there is dissipation at the boundaries of the lattice. They find that the probability distribution of avalanche sizes follows a power law with the same exponent as for a single abelian sandpile [2, 3].

Consider the representation of the sandpiles z_1 and z_2 in terms of a sandpile $z_{min}(i) \equiv \min\{z_1(i), z_2(i)\}$, and a process $\Delta z(i) \equiv |z_2(i) - z_1(i)|$ at each site. Also define $z_{max}(i) \equiv \max\{z_1(i), z_2(i)\}$. The threshold condition in this representation is simply $z_{min} > 3$ (on a 2D square lattice). When the toppling condition is satisfied, both z_1 and z_2 topple. Hence, during toppling events, Δz does not change. Δz changes only when grains are added to either pile: when a grain is added to $z_{min}(i)$, $\Delta z(i)$ decreases by 1 and when grains are added to $z_{max}(i)$ it increases by 1. Addition to $z_1(i)$ results in addition to $z_{max}(i)$ if $z_1(i) \geq z_2(i)$ and $z_{min}(i)$ if $z_1 < z_2$. When $z_1(i) = z_2(i)$, that is, $\Delta z(i) = 0$, addition to either pile at site i results in addition only to the z_{max} pile.

The addition processes, for large times, are independent Poisson processes at each site, and hence the absolute value of their difference, which is the marginal process $\Delta z(i)$, is at each site an independent random walk reflected at the origin. The marginal process z_{min}, on the other hand, has the same evolution as a single sandpile on the 2D square lattice, except during addition at a site i where $z_1(i) = z_2(i)$, ie, $\Delta z(i) = 0$. Hence, when you consider the sequence of configurations of the sandpile z_{min}, sometimes a configuration stays longer than it would in a BTW sandpile process. Thus the observed frequencies of various configurations in z_{min} are different from those in a BTW process by amounts proportional to the probability of finding $\Delta z(i) = 0$. Since $\Delta z(i)$ is a random walk reflected at the origin, this probability falls as $t^{-1/2}$, and hence at large times the process z_{min} is exactly the same as a single sandpile, and its steady-state is the same.

Because the toppling is controlled by z_{min}, so are the avalanches. Thus the avalanche distributions for the coupled sandpiles z_1 and z_2 are the same as those for the single sandpile z_{min}, and hence in the steady-state they are the same as for a single BTW sandpile. A prediction of this argument is that z_{max} averaged over the lattice grows with time as $t^{1/2}$. For a 10x10 lattice, this is shown in figure 1.



FIG. 1: $\langle z_{max} \rangle$ (dashed red line), $\langle \Delta z \rangle$ (dotted blue line) and $\langle z_{min} \rangle$ (dot-dashed pink line) for a 10x10 lattice vs time, on a log-log scale. The solid line is the function 1.5 $t^{1/2}$.

The representation in terms of z_{min} and z_{max} also helps understand the large variations seen in the height profile of either of the sandpiles z_1 and z_2 in [1], fig. 5 (b). This is because each site of z_1 is randomly either constrained to be less than 4, or grows as $\sim t^{1/2}$, which results in large uncorrelated variations from site to site.

Acknowledgements - I thank Vikram Tripathi and Rajdeep Sensharma for discussions. I thank Deepak Dhar for helpful suggestions and a careful reading of the

*Electronic address: dandekar@theory.tifr.res.in

manuscript.

[1] Lei Liu and Fei Hu, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **105**, 40006 (2014).
[2] P. Bak, C. Tang, and K. Wiesenfeld, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 381 (1987).
[3] D. Dhar, Physica A, **369** 29 (2006)